

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Wednesday, February 9, 2022**  
**7:00 p.m.**

A quorum being present at City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah, the meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Kevin Daly, Chair  
Mason Kjar  
Matt Larsen  
Heidi Shegrud  
Becki Wright, Vice Chair

**MEMBER ABSENT**

Christina Wilcox

**STAFF PRESENT**

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director  
Lisa Romney, City Attorney  
Mackenzie Wood, Assistant Planner

**VISITORS**

Chad Morris  
Interested citizens

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**OPENING COMMENTS/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER**

Commissioner Shegrud shared the following comment: "Centerville is basically built out and we are working on infill projects. This is much like working on a patchwork quilt that has a few holes here and there that need to be filled. Changing the patches out of our Centerville quilt is a transformation. Transformation is not a future event, it's a present activity, and the creation of that patchwork quilt is ever-changing as the holes get filled in. I hope that we have in our minds what we want the outcome to look like so we don't get lost on our way. This is why an updated general plan is so important. The general plan is what gives us the direction that we should be going."

**PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE MAP AMENDMENT – 1756 NORTH MAIN STREET**

Assistant Planner Mackenzie Wood explained the applicant recently purchased property from a neighbor to the south and sold a portion of their property to the same neighbor to align the properties with an existing wall. This would typically involve a boundary line adjustment application that would not be heard by the Planning Commission or City Council. However, the piece of land purchased by the applicant was zoned Residential Low, and the applicant's property was zoned Agricultural Low. Two zones cannot be present on one piece of property, so the zone map amendment process was instigated to bring the two parcels into conformance. Ms. Wood said staff recommended approval of the proposed zone map amendment.

Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 7:05 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Commissioner Shegrud made a **motion** to approve the Zone Map Amendment of property located at 1756 North Main Street from Residential Low to Agricultural Low with the following reasons for action. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

Reasons for Action:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that there has been a sufficient review and consideration of the criteria found in CZC Section 12.21.080(e).
- b. The Planning Commission finds that the zone map amendment is substantially consistent with the goals of the General Plan, as described in the staff report.

**PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE MAP AMENDMENT – CHAD MORRIS**

Ms. Wood explained the applicant was in the process of purchasing property located to the southwest of the subdivision-in-progress, Canyon Point. The piece of land purchased was zoned Residential Low (R-L), and the applicant's properties were zoned Residential Medium (R-M). Two zones cannot be present on one piece of property, and the zone map amendment process was instigated to bring the in-process subdivision into Code compliance. Ms. Wood reviewed Centerville Neighborhood 1 and Deuel Creek Historic District objectives with the Planning Commission, and said staff recommended approval of the proposed zone map amendment.

Chad Morris, applicant, stated the property was currently zoned R-L, but sat in what would naturally be the R-M Zone, with three of the abutting properties zoned R-M. Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 7:10 p.m., and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Chair Daly and Commissioner Shegrud commented that the request seemed straightforward and made sense.

Commissioner Larsen **moved** to approve the Zone Map Amendment of property located at 295 East 300 North, parcel 02-099-0030, from Residential Low to Residential Medium with the following reasons for action. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

Reasons for Action:

- a. The Planning Commission finds that there has been a sufficient review and consideration of the criteria found in CZC Section 12.21.080(e).
- b. The Planning Commission finds that the zone map amendment is substantially consistent with the goals of the General Plan, as described in the staff report.

**CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN – CANYON POINT DEVELOPMENT – 347 NORTH 400 EAST**

Community Development Director Cory Snyder said the applicant, South Davis Home Rentals, LLC, represented by Chad Morris, joined several properties together in order to build a multi-family and single-family mixed-residential development at approximately 347 North 400 East called Canyon Point in Centerville. The applicant was seeking acceptance of a Conceptual Site Plan differing from the project previously reviewed. The new design included additional land located in the southwest corner, rezoned to R-M with the previous agenda item.

The newly proposed conceptual plan depicted two duplex-style buildings and seven single-family homes (1 existing/6 new). All dwelling units would be provided a double car garage and would be one-story in height. All units would share private street access, visitor parking, and a central common open space feature. It was anticipated that the proposed development would be platted as a planned unit development (PUD) subdivision to allow exceptions for selling each dwelling unit.



1 Mr. Snyder emphasized the entire proposed development (duplexes and single-family  
2 units) were reviewed by staff with R-M development standards. He explained that all  
3 development within the Deuel Creek Historic District could apply for adjustment of setbacks,  
4 with the idea of encouraging compatibility with existing Historic District architecture. He spoke of  
5 Historic District design standards, and incentives for meeting at least four of the recommended  
6 architectural elements.

7  
8 Mr. Snyder explained that City ordinance encouraged including both passive and active  
9 recreation features in open space in the R-M Zone. The Planning Commission could approve  
10 the 40% landscaping with the common garden area as proposed, or could approve a "waiver  
11 allowance" by reducing the landscaping to 30%, provided that the development layout  
12 incorporate desired elements related to active and passive open space. Mr. Snyder commented  
13 that single-family development was exempted from the 40% requirement, and said it was staff's  
14 suggestion that because the proposed project was a mix of residential use types, the Planning  
15 Commission entertain a waiver allowance to encourage a balance between the two use types. A  
16 landscaping plan must be submitted with a Final Site Plan.

17  
18 Responding to a question from the Commission, Mr. Snyder explained that in R-M  
19 development, setbacks were calculated from public streets, not private lanes. The entire  
20 proposed development would sit on one lot, and the applicant had the ability to choose whether  
21 to declare Parrish Lane or 400 East as the "front".

22  
23 Chad Morris, applicant, said he believed a pavilion/outside gathering area would be  
24 utilized by the residents, but said he was willing to consider a pickleball court or other options.  
25 He said he was unsure if the existing residence would need to be part of the HOA.  
26 Commissioner Kjar suggested that all units in the development should be part of the HOA. Mr.  
27 Morris said he had considered demolishing the existing unit for a new build, but explained that  
28 only one unit would fit on the footprint of the existing home, a duplex would not be possible, and  
29 two units would be needed for the decision to be financially wise. He explained that drainage  
30 plans for the project were not finalized.

31  
32 Commissioner Larsen said he believed there was value in maintaining an existing  
33 structure, and commented that the existing home already fit in with the two existing homes  
34 directly to the east. Chair Daly said he liked the idea of a common garden area. Mr. Morris and  
35 the Planning Commission discussed landscaping possibilities.

36  
37 Chair Daly opened a public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

38  
39 Chuck Madsen, Centerville resident, said the planned private lane would be directly  
40 behind his property. He asked if there would be a buffer (e.g., fence, landscaping) between his  
41 property and the private lane to mitigate the impact of traffic. He expressed concern regarding  
42 potential snow removal.

43  
44 Eldon Marshall, Centerville resident, said he lived west of the proposed development. He  
45 expressed concern regarding potential drainage issues, and asked what protection residents to  
46 the west would have. Mr. Marshall said he had not been able to understand much of the  
47 discussion that evening.

48  
49 Mr. Madsen expressed concern that the private lane would put traffic on three sides of  
50 his property.

51  
52 Chair Daly closed the public hearing at 8:11 p.m. He explained that the City Engineer  
53 would review plans to ensure drainage would not pose an imminent threat to neighbors to the  
54 west. Responding to a question from Commissioner Wright regarding the comment of a



1 residence potentially surrounded by street on three sides, Mr. Snyder repeated that private  
2 lanes through multi-family development were not considered streets. He compared the private  
3 lane to a driveway on the single lot.  
4

5 Mr. Snyder spoke of retention versus detention, and explained that if the City Engineer  
6 found retention would not be feasible on the property, the City could grant a variance to State  
7 requirements, and the developer could design a detention system. He said it was his  
8 understanding that retention on the property would have some overflow that would need to be  
9 directed to the Parrish Lane drainage system.  
10

11 Chad Morris said there was not a privacy fence currently included on the plan for the  
12 north side of the development where the private lane would run behind existing homes. Mr.  
13 Snyder stated a privacy fence was required on the south side of the development where  
14 differing zones met, but would not be required by the City between the new development and  
15 existing homes to the north since all properties involved were in the same zone. He suggested  
16 the property owners could work with the developer to partner on construction of a fence if  
17 desired. Mr. Morris expressed willingness to work with the property owners regarding a buffer.  
18 Mr. Morris pointed out where on the property he anticipated snow removal could occur, and  
19 explained plans for waste removal. Commissioner Shegrud suggested Mr. Morris try to  
20 persuade the Postal Service to not place a post box pedestal in the same location he  
21 anticipated using for snow removal. Mr. Morris stated a drainage line would run drainage out to  
22 Parrish Lane.  
23

24 Commissioner Shegrud said she did not like the private lane behind the existing  
25 residences. She said she did not believe the proposed development as designed was  
26 compatible with the goals of the Deuel Creek Historic District. She expressed the opinion that  
27 the conceptual site plan did not fit with the large landscaped property/moderate-sized homes in  
28 the Historic District, and said she did not believe a private lane intersecting the roads so close to  
29 the Parrish Lane/400 East intersection was consistent with the Historic District. Chair Daly  
30 commented that larger multi-family structures already existed directly west of the proposed  
31 development. He pointed out that the single-family properties Commissioner Shegrud spoke of  
32 were in a different zone than the subject property.  
33

34 Commissioner Wright said she believed it was important to look at how proposed  
35 development would affect existing residences, in particular in this case, the two homes along  
36 Parrish Lane not included in the project. She expressed the hope that the two properties would  
37 be considered and respected if the project moved forward. Commissioner Wright said there  
38 were aspects she really liked about the proposed project, and spoke of the need for a diversity  
39 of housing types in the City. She said she was okay with the conceptual site plan from an  
40 administrative standpoint.  
41

42 Chair Daly said the current proposal was his favorite of the multiple development plans  
43 he had seen for the subject property. Chair Daly made a **motion** for the Planning Commission  
44 to accept the Conceptual Site Plan for Canyon Point in Centerville, located at approximately 347  
45 North 400 East, with the following directives and reasons for action. Commissioner Larsen  
46 seconded the motion, which passed by majority vote (4-1), with Commissioner Shegrud  
47 dissenting.  
48

49 Directives:  
50

- 51 1. This Conceptual Plan Acceptance shall terminate the previous related Conceptual  
52 Site Plan Acceptance dated July 14, 2021.



2. This Conceptual Plan Acceptance shall be subject to obtaining a rezone of the isolated parcel, from R-L to R-M and shall be assimilated into the proposed development prior to any final site plan submittal.
3. If the rezone is not granted by the City, this Conceptual Site Plan Acceptance shall become null and void, and a new conceptual site plan submittal shall be required to determine if it can be adequately shown how the property may be developed without the rezone.
4. A Final Site Plan shall be submitted as outlined in Section 12.21.110(e) of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
5. The Final Site Plan shall provide a complete landscaping plan, designed by a Landscape Architect. According to 12.51.060 one tree and two shrubs shall be provided per dwelling unit.
6. The applicant shall provide the expected additional open space features as outlined in CZC 12.32.55 for Residential Zones and may seek the allowable waiver, as outlined in CZC 12.51.070(g) of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. The new fencing along the west property line needs to be reduced to the 4-foot limitation when encroaching into the front yard setback along the 400 North Street.
8. The site layout shall be corrected to meet the setback requirements from 400 North Street, or the applicant may seek the Deuel Creek Design Incentives to allow the 20-foot setback.
9. If the applicant desires to have signage for the project, this shall be indicated on the final site plan and meet the requirements listed in Chapter 12.54 of the Zoning Ordinance.
10. The Final Site Plan submittal shall subsequently conform to this accepted conceptual plan, as outlined in CZC 12.21.110(f)(1).

Reasons for Action:

- a) The conceptual site plan submittal has adequately shown how the property may be developed [(CZC 12.21.110(d)(2))].
- b) The development appears to satisfy the goals and objectives found within the Centerville City General Plan, Section 12-480-2(b) (3) & 12-480-2(b) (4).
- c) The proposed conceptual site plan, with the directives given, appears to likely be capable of satisfying the applicable Development Standards for the R-M Zone.

**DEFINITION OF "LOCATION" FOR FOOD TRUCK ORDINANCE**

On January 26, 2022, the Planning Commission recommended City Council approval of Ordinance No. 2022-01 amending various provisions of the Zoning Code and Municipal Code regarding Food Trucks. The Planning Commission suggested staff look into a new definition of "location" for purposes of regulating food trucks. City Attorney Lisa Romney proposed the following definition of "location" or "same location" as used in the new Food Truck Ordinances:

"Location or Same Location: Location or same location shall mean that a food truck is parked, located, or operated on the same lot or parcel number."

A majority of the Commission expressed approval.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Referring to the Canyon Point Conceptual Site Plan, Mr. Snyder said he believed the north side of the property was a better location for the private lane (as proposed) than the south side of the property. He commented that Centerville was, in general, missing the middle housing market, and suggested infill was an appropriate place to think about middle housing. The

1 Planning Commission was scheduled to meet next on February 23, 2022. Mr. Snyder reported  
2 on recent actions by the City Council.

3  
4 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

5  
6 Minutes of the January 26, 2022 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Wright **moved**  
7 to accept the minutes. Commissioner Larsen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous  
8 vote (5-0).

9  
10 **ADJOURNMENT**

11  
12 At 8:57 p.m., Chair Daly **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded  
13 the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

14  
15  
16   
17  
18 Jennifer Hansen, City Recorder

3-9-2022  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved

19  
20  
21   
22  
23 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

